

Minutes of the Executive Committee
Monday, February 20, 2006

Chair Dwyer called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: County Board Supervisors Jim Dwyer (Chair), Duane Paulson, Pat Haukohl, Walter Kolb, Dick Manke, Bill Mitchell. **Absent:** Supervisors Duane Stamsta and Duane Paulson. Supervisor Paulson attended part of the meeting via conference call.

Also Present: Chief of Staff Lee Esler, Office Services Coordinator Windy Jicha, Supervisor Rodell Singert, UW-Extension Director Marcia Jante, Community Development Coordinator Glen Lewinski, County Clerk Kathy Nickolaus, Joanne Weideman, Supervisor Rodell Singert, Supervisor Bonnie Morris, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Scott Williams, Supervisor Dave Swan, Office Services Coordinator Donna Simmert, Senior Financial Analyst Clara Daniels, Land Information Systems Manager Don Dittmar, Freeman Reporter Larry Silver, Legislative Policy Advisor Dave Krahn, Senior Planner Kathy Moore, Director of Park and Planning Dale Shaver, Supervisor Kathleen Cummings, Supervisor Joe Marchese, Chief of Staff Allison Bussler, County Board Candidate Fritz Ruff, Chris Lufter, Program Assistant Nancy Mojica.

Public Comment

- Joanne Weideman spoke in favor of downsizing the board to 25 members. She is not in favor of downsizing to seven or nine districts because it will set up a system that is more political and less non-partisan.
- Nickolaus explained to the committee how changes to the size of the board would affect voting. She also explained how redistricting would decrease the types of ballots needed per election which saves the county money.

Correspondence

Dwyer distributed and reviewed the list of correspondence. He said Supervisors should request copies of the listed items from Jicha.

Approve the Minutes of February 6, 2006

MOTION: Haukohl moved, Mitchell second, to approve the minutes of February 6, 2006. Motion carried 5-0.

Discuss and Consider 160-A-027: Appointment Gay Alberts Ruby to the Federated Library Board

MOTION: Mitchell moved, Manke second, to approve 160-A-027. Motion carried 5-0.

Discuss and Consider 160-A-028: Appointment of Rev. Allan A. Jahneke to the Ethics Board

MOTION: Haukohl moved, Kolb second, to approve 160-A-028. Motion carried 5-0.

Committee Reports by Committee Chairs for the Following Meetings:

February 8, 2006 – Finance – Haukohl said the committee approved several ordinances. They heard a year-end status report of capital projects and approved closeout amounts for remaining projects. The committee had a discussion on courthouse security.

February 16, 2006 – Public Works – Manke said the committee heard status updates on capital projects and courthouse security and approved bids for the Moor Downs Golf Course Clubhouse.

February 16, 2006 – Health and Human Services – This meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather.

February 17, 2006 – Judiciary and Law Enforcement – Mitchell said the committee heard a report on the security incident reports and updates on Courthouse security, the new jail and state legislature. The

committee also approved the ordinance to change the salary range for the medical examiner and pathologist.

Discuss Ordinance 160-O-121: Transfer Carryover Funds from 2005 Unexpended Appropriations to 2006 Budgeted Appropriations (UW-Extension)

Jante said UW-Extension didn't spend all their grant money in 2005 because they were fiscally conservative. They stretched money and parlayed it into more money.

Haukohl said she's concerned with the delays in recruitment and staff training. Jante said the majority of people hired by UW-Extension are hired as academic staff through the university, which allows them university benefits and salary ranges. The university posting system takes about 60 days to set up and three to four months to hire staff. In most cases, people are hired on a year-to-year basis with jobs ending when contracts ends.

Jante said some grants require you to spend funds by the end of a certain time period. If there are no further program needs, some grants allow you to purchase supplies or turn the money back in to the grantor. We are only able to use the funds for the specific grant objectives. The intention is to use all the funds listed here.

Discuss and Consider Ordinance 160-O-117: Amend the Waukesha County Code to Repeal and Recreate Sections Regarding Establishing and Creating Nineteen Supervisory Districts in Waukesha County

Discuss and Consider Ordinance 160-O-118: Amend the Waukesha County Code to Repeal and Recreate Sections Regarding Establishing and Creating Twenty-Five Supervisory Districts in Waukesha County

Dwyer announced that Supervisor Paulson would be joining the committee discussion via conference call.

MOTION: Mitchell moved, Manke second, to approve Ordinance 160-O-118 and 117.

Dwyer said this is a different process than the board used in the past. In the past, the board size was determined and then the districts were drawn to avoid gerrymandering.

Moore and Dittmar explained how the county board districts were divided for these ordinances. In the beginning Moore said she developed a concept plan of what communities needed to be together. She looked at similar issues such as border agreements, sanitary sewer districts, school districts (a very minor piece), etc. There is a set amount of people per district with deviations due to annexations. Once the conceptual plan was done, she gave it to Dittmar.

Dittmar said on January 1, 2006, they got the up-to-date ward plans from all communities. He used the concept plan done by Moore and the 2000 census blocks as required by statutes to assign wards according to population. Because of annexations, the report has more wards than what appears in the county code. Dittmar worked with the County Clerk, Register of Deeds and municipalities to set up the districts within the wards. He made adjustments to population according to annexations. No other growth was allowed per legislation.

Mitchell asked was there any political pressure on where to draw the lines? Moore said she did not feel any pressure.

Mitchell said he represents two towns. Town leaders feel that downsizing is bad because they won't be properly represented. Shaver said the cities will feel the effects of downsizing more than towns. Shaver distributed and reviewed a handout titled "Analysis of Supervisor Districts with Representation of Unincorporated Residents in Waukesha County." The handout explains why towns should not be concerned with the redistricting.

Dwyer said supervisors represent the county as a whole. We don't just serve towns or cities. We try to follow what the towns/cities want.

Kolb said he serves the will of the people in his district first. If an issue doesn't affect his district, then he looks at it for the good of the entire county. The towns want as much representation as they can have because the county controls towns' land use issues.

Manke said during his 28 years of service, the county has thrived. Downsizing is a tool that will save \$100K but doesn't do anything to improve the efficiency in the county. Maybe we should look at reducing the board size to seven or nine supervisors and getting rid of the county executive. He feels rushed to make this decision. Why is this the first thing the county executive, a former state legislator, does to make his mark? The county could save money if we paid supervisors on per diems. He's disappointed this came at this time. He will vote against both of these ordinances but may vote to downsize to seven or nine.

Mitchell asked why did they choose to downsize to 25 and 19 districts? Dittmar and Moore said because they were told to do so.

Dwyer said there's a bill in Madison to downsize the state legislature. Did Vrakas or Nitschke sign onto the bill? The first thing they do when they leave the state legislature is to downsize the board they are coming to. The county board has done a good job and put Waukesha County on the top. Whatever we do, we will be criticized. We are criticized when we cancel a meeting because there isn't enough for an agenda. We are criticized for having 30 minute meetings and paying expenses. We are being pushed by the state. The state legislature is pushing a TABOR bill on the counties to control county spending when Waukesha County has fewer problems than the state. We need to look at whether or not the constitutional officers should be replaced by professionals. Are we paying too much for constitutional officers? The good functioning counties with five to nine supervisors don't have a county executive. They hire county administrators. There are only four states that have larger boards. Many of the other counties have partisan elections. The state constitution will not allow us to do this. The term should be changed to four years to give supervisors time to learn and do a good job. You need to determine how many members you want on each committee. You may as well make the supervisors full time and have committees of the whole. Let's do this the right way and look at how county government can change. We need to look at how other counties run their board and what will save the county money. These ordinances aren't about saving money but making the board more partisan. The public doesn't understand the work the 35 supervisors have done. Maybe we need to look at assessing fines for supervisors who don't attend meetings. With a smaller board, supervisors will have to serve on two committees and two boards. Many business people won't have the time to do this. We have a good mix of people on the board now. When you go to a smaller board with attendance at the county three days per week, you will get a different group of people in office. There's no magic number. We may be more efficient with fewer supervisors but we'll have to hire more auditors to keep their eye on things.

Kolb said he agrees with Dwyer. He doesn't think many people understand what goes on here. If you are going to increase the workload and decrease the board size, you will have a more professional type of board. When you have fewer people, it is easier for the county executive to get programs through. In all levels of government, each group wants to get more power to push things through. He doesn't think this happens in Waukesha County. He's not getting rich being a supervisor. He doesn't care if he gets paid. He's here because the town asked him to be here. If you want to screw up a system that's working and you can prove it will be cheaper then go for it. If he has to have a larger workload he will need more people to help him. The supervisors are dedicating their time because they want to serve their constituents. With 35 supervisors, there's no big power base. If you want to cut the size of the board to keep an eye on it, be honest about what the expenses and costs will be. He's proud of the way this county operates, the cost of the board and efficiency of this government as a whole. It works well. He would like to see proof that a smaller board will be more efficient. With a smaller board, people won't have as much time to review things.

Haukohl said she disagrees with downsizing the board. Larger county boards have greater fiscal responsibility. The problem with the process is that she doesn't understand where the change comes from. Where did the numbers 19 and 25 come from? She'd like to see an analysis of other counties and their relationships with the state. She thinks the current size of the board works well. Waukesha County is a top county. Why is everyone coming after us? What have we done wrong? Of all the people who think we're doing things wrong, have they been to board meetings? She became a supervisor because she had concerns for the issues. She won't vote for either of these ordinances. She won't object to resolutions to look at other county governments. The fiscal note shows how much money will be saved but it doesn't show how the board will be restructured or how it will work.

Shaver said in the past, there was discussion of combining the Personnel and Finance Committees so 25 total board members would work. The discussion of 19 members went back County Executive Finley's recommendation to look at how Milwaukee County works with 19 supervisors in 2001. At that time, Finley asked us to look at mapping for 19 districts.

Mitchell said he would like to ask Vrakas how he came up with these numbers. Mitchell sees the board as a watchdog. We have a board of real people with real jobs and real lives. A cynical person would ask if the county executive is trying to reduce the oversight on him. He would ask the county executive to make concessions like allowing municipalities to do their own zoning. He would ask the county executive not to put in any new taxes on towns. Mitchell isn't married to the idea of 35 supervisors. He likes that we have a part time board and would like it to continue. The current system works and a change would cost money. He's heard that larger boards save money. There are more people to serve on boards and commissions, RFPs, etc. Why stop at 19 supervisors? Esler's plan of five supervisors would save \$850K. If we reduce the number of supervisors we will have to restructure. Milwaukee County went to 19 full time supervisors at a cost of \$1.4 million to residents. The board will have to have less oversight if it is smaller.

Mitchell said with fewer supervisors, you will lose people who work for a living. You will lose many more if you go to full time. He knows a change will happen. We will have better control if we make the change here. He was disappointed that Haukohl was misquoted in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel about downsizing. He supports looking at other options for a much smaller board than 19 or 25 members but he prefers the part time status. He's stretched with his time now with everything he does for the county.

Manke said he agrees we need to study this more. He'd like to look other options such as a board of five, seven or nine members. There are concerns that one-third of the current supervisors do the work. You could save \$500K if you got rid of the county executive.

Dwyer suggested that the committee keep these ordinances on the table to allow staff time to look at counties of similar sizes to see how they function with smaller boards, their governances, whether or not they have a county executive, staffing budgets, salaries, types of services delivered, etc. He would like staff to send a letter to supervisors inquiring what their concerns are and what they think is the appropriate number of supervisors.

MOTION: Kolb moved, Manke second, to table Ordinances 160-O-118 and 160-O-117. Motion carried: 5-0.

Discuss Ordinance 160-O-121: Transfer Carryover Funds from 2005 Unexpended Appropriations to 2006 Budgeted Appropriations (CDBG)

Lewinski said a lot of CDBG carryover relate to UW-Extension. Most of the projects are underway. There is a large amount of money being carried over for HOME projects because of the way the allocations are handled. The money in the HOME account is used for revolving loans. In HOME, we anticipated funds going down 8% this year but they went down 10%. We had to use available unallocated funds and program income. Some of the carryover funds are from four county projects. Some counties haven't allocated the money yet.

Haukohl asked if the \$33K of unallocated funds is for housing development? Lewinski said we use that to fund shortfalls and a few projects. Since the report was finished, we have allocated the unallocated funds.

Esler said he is trying to reconcile the carryover amount of \$1.2 million for CDBG. The carryover in the 2006 budget is in the range of \$2.5 million. How did we explain the difference in carryovers from \$1.2 million to \$2.5 million? Lewinski said we're only carrying over unencumbered money. We have \$1.9 million unspent for projects. The ordinance only pertains to unencumbered funds. This is money without a purchase order attached to it. We try to keep money in our budgets to close out projects.

Future Agenda Item

- Midyear review of the CDBG 2003-2004 fund balances.

Update on 2006 CDBG HOME Grant Award

Lewinski said our award went down 10.2%, which is consistent with other areas of the state. There are seven criteria they look at across the board to make the determination. They're supposed to be consistent. On the HOME side, we went down 4.3% even though we added Germantown this year. It's all formula driven. It is difficult to get a full explanation of the formula from the federal government. You just accept their explanation and take the money. He anticipates the award being reduced again.

Dwyer asked are you planning a change of strategy in anticipation of this cut? How will you balance this year's allocation? Lewinski said we will do the regular application process but will have to change the allocation process and possibly include a public hearing. We will eliminate programs if the cut is large.

Dwyer asked will this be discussed with the CDBG board ahead of time? Lewinski said we have been talking about it. Dwyer recommended collaborations to reduce duplication. Lewinski said there is some duplication but not a lot. The board needs to determine what are critical services and what should be cut if money is reduced.

Executive Committee
February 20, 2006

MOTION: Haukohl moved, Mitchell second, to adjourn the meeting at 11:16 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter L. Kolb
Secretary